

To the Honorable Commissioners of the FCC,

I am writing to you today to comment on Docket No. 02-277, The Biennial Review of the FCC's broadcast media ownership rules. I am voicing my support to retain all the FCC rules in question. These rules set limits on concentration of the broadcast industry and serve the public interest by preserving diversity of ownership in the broadcast marketplace. These rules are; The Television-Radio Cross-Ownership Rule, The Broadcast-Newspaper Cross Ownership Ban, The National Television Ownership Rule, The Duopoly Rule for Radio, The Local Television Ownership Rule, and The Dual Network Rule.

The great privilege to carry on informed debate and discussion of current events, both locally and globally is part of the founding philosophy of this country. If the avenues for sharing information are restricted to very few, then I fear that the quality of the information presented will decay. What is the value of varied information sources when they are controlled by a single voice? Let competition rule so as to have a diversity of opinion presented..

If the channels to a potential audience -- be they cable programming channels, local television stations, or even newspapers that promote and review independent works --- fall into the hands of even fewer corporate owners, sharing the work of any independent artist will become much harder.

In such an environment, the commercial interest inevitably compromises the public interest. The FCC has rules limiting ownership to preserve the ecology of a healthy marketplace of ideas. If the FCC undermines this ecology by removing the rules, it undermines the future health of the marketplace of information.

Congress and the Supreme Court have long recognized that a functioning democracy depends on a media open to independent and unconventional news and a varied entertainment media. Media makers working outside the corporate environment continually provide content that is so defined. This unconventionality and variety that stimulates the American people both causes us to constantly question the status quo, and facilitates the ability of Americans to speak with one another. If we exist in an environment in which our news outlets have merged together, both print and broadcast, our ability to open informed discussion is restricted. To suggest that internet access to the BBC or foreign media can replace local media diversity is to suggest a fantasy that our democracy can not pretend and still remain a democracy.

I urge you to rule in the public interest on this matter. The public interest will be served by preserving the FCC's Broadcast Media ownership rules. Indeed I urge you to adopted rules that make concentration of media ownership less likely than under the current media ownership rules, perhaps forcing the 10 largest media owning corporations, and the top 10 companies that are "networks," to divest so that the no more than 5 media outlets in total, and no more than one media outlet per city is permitted to be under one ownership or corporate umbrella.

Thank you,

William Chirolas

199 Concord Street

Newton, MA 02462

-----_NextPart_000_0245_01C29B01.D7CEEBD0

Content-Type: text/html;

charset="US-ASCII"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

<!doctype html public "-//w3c//dtd html 4.0 transitional//en">
<html>

<head>

<META HTTP-EQUIV=3D"Content-Type" CONTENT=3D"text/html;
charset=3Dus-ascii">

<meta name=3DGenerator content=3D"Microsoft Word 10 (filtered)">

<style>

<!--

/* Style Definitions */

p.MsoNormal, li.MsoNormal, div.MsoNormal

{margin:0in;

margin-bottom:.0001pt;

font-size:12.0pt;

font-family:"Times New Roman";}

a:link, span.MsoHyperlink

{color:blue;

text-decoration:underline;}

a:visited, span.MsoHyperlinkFollowed

{color:blue;

text-decoration:underline;}

p

{margin-right:0in;

margin-left:0in;

font-size:12.0pt;

font-family:"Times New Roman";}

span.EmailStyle18

{font-family:Arial;

color:navy;}

@page Section1

{size:8.5in 11.0in;

margin:1.0in 1.25in 1.0in 1.25in;}

div.Section1

{page:Section1;}

-->

</style>

</head>

<body lang=3DEN-US link=3Dblue vlink=3Dblue>

are; The Television-Radio Cross-Ownership Rule, The Broadcast-Newspaper Cross Ownership Ban, The National Television Ownership Rule, The Duopoly Rule for Radio, The Local Television Ownership Rule, and The Dual Network Rule.

The great privilege to carry on informed debate and discussion of current events, both locally and globally is part of the founding philosophy of this country. If the avenues for sharing information are restricted to very few, then I fear that the quality of the information presented will decay. What is the value of varied information sources when they are controlled by a single voice? Let competition rule so as to have a diversity of opinion presented.

If the channels to a potential audience -- be they cable programming channels, local television stations, or even news papers that promote and review independent works -- fall into the hands of even fewer corporate owners, sharing the work of any independent artist will become much harder.

In such an environment, the commercial interest inevitably compromises the public interest. The FCC has rules limiting ownership to preserve the ecology of a healthy marketplace of ideas. If the FCC undermines this ecology by removing the rules, it undermines the future health of the marketplace of information.

Congress and the Supreme Court have long recognized that a functioning democracy depends on a media open to independent and unconventional news and a varied entertainment media. Media makers working outside the corporate environment continually provide content that is so defined. This unconventionality and variety that stimulates the American

people
both causes us to constantly question the status quo, and facilitates
the
ability of Americans to speak with one another. If we exist in an
environment
in which our news outlets have merged together, both print and broadcast, our ability to open informed discussion is restricted. To suggest that internet access to the BBC or foreign media can replace local media diversity is to suggest a fantasy that our democracy can not pretend and still remain a democracy.</p>

<p>I urge you to rule in the public interest on this matter. The public interest will be served by preserving the FCC's Broadcast Media ownership rules. Indeed I urge you to adopted rules that make concentration of media ownership less likely than under the current media ownership rules, perhaps forcing the 10 largest media owning corporations, and the top 10 companies that are “networks,” to divest so that the no more than 5 media outlets in total, and no more than one media outlet per city is permitted to be under one ownership or corporate umbrella.</p>

<p>Thank you, </p>

<p>William Chirolas</p>

<p>199 Concord Street</p>

<p>Newton,MA 02462</p>

</div>

</body>

</html>

-----=_NextPart_000_0245_01C29B01.D7CEEBD0--